
Fort Wayne's Urban Vision

Alec Johnson, March 11, 2016

Introduction

How to Attract and Retain Young Talent: Fort Wayne's Urban Vision and Future Challenges. This assigned topic is a great leaping off point, but in the grand Quest tradition, I have taken some liberties, and simultaneously expanded its reach while narrowing my focus on its implications. In the course of my research, and in conducting many interviews with millennials, baby boomers, generation x'ers, the silent generation, and the greatest generation, it has become quite clear that the things which may attract talent are not so much driven by age or the era into which we happen to have been born, but by the quality of our understanding of what all people are looking for. What do we desire? What does it take to make us happy? There **will** be a discussion of what young people in particular want - what will attract and retain the venerated millennial, but we do not plan and design cities for single demographics . Again, my research has led to some conclusions that highlight our commonality across generations, as opposed to our differences.

It is also true that in addition to the family, friends, and colleagues we surround ourselves with, the single greatest factor in determining our well being is the community in which we live. Our city. Our cities are our great experiment. As much as we like to believe that our cities have grown up organically like so many complex

ant hills spread across the breadth of our great country, our cities have in fact been an experiment in design and in function.

It is not often that we look closely at how this experiment has fared. This is such a time. This topic has led me into investigating how our cities have evolved into what we experience today. It has asked of me the questions - who are we as citizens, the inhabitants of our cities and towns, and what makes us happy?

The psychology of happiness is a fascinating topic in itself, and although I have been tempted otherwise, I will cover this only to the extent that it relates to the inhabitability of the city, and it most certainly does relate. City planning, or more accurately described, city design, is the mechanism by which our hopes and desire as a culture are translated into the real and the tangible. It is in our nature to go forth and populate the earth. Thus follows our abodes, our neighborhoods, our centers of commerce and trade, our civic buildings, our institutes of governance, religion and education, our places of leisure, of entertainment, and our edifices to art and beauty. All of these great things must be physically organized and laid upon the landscape. Who decides how, and with whose direction are we best to entrust these decisions? They are important, as I will describe.

So what is our vision as a city?

A quote from the Edmund N. Bacon book, *Design of Cities* (circa 1967) -

“The building of cities is one of man’s greatest achievements. The form of his city will always be a **pitiless** indicator of the state of his civilization. This form is determined by the multiplicity of decisions made by the people who live in it. In

certain circumstances these decisions have interacted to produce a force of such clarity and form that a noble city has been born.”ⁱ

Have we created a noble city in Fort Wayne? As a whole, can we argue that our collective ambition and action over two centuries has resulted in a place that demonstrates our highest moral principles, our shared ideals, and our greatest aspirations?

This is a high standard, perhaps an impossible standard. So then, in what ways **have** we hit the mark? Are there places and spaces in our fair city where we have managed to get the city-building recipe just right? Which of our streets, Calhoun Street, Rudisill Boulevard, Lima Road, Forest Park Boulevard, or Coliseum Boulevard, provide the most benefit in terms of a streets functions of circulation for all modes of travel, for connecting buildings and neighborhoods, and for providing safe passage along and across? Which of our neighborhoods are the most vibrant, healthy, equitable, safe, and beautiful? Some of these criteria are a matter of taste of course, but some are absolutely necessary for a healthy functioning city.

I will identify and describe a handful of new paradigms in city design. These newly emerging practices have the potential to be much more nimble and adaptive than our previous and current planning policy and practice which are unwieldy, constrictive, and as I will describe, largely counter-productive.

Of course, a city without its people is a ruin. It is history. So let’s begin by taking a look at the people whom inhabit it.

Demographics

According to the US Census, the population of Fort Wayne in 2010 was 253,691 with an approximate predicted population increase of about 1,000 people per year, putting us at around 260,000 today. Within that population, about 38% are millennials, 22% are baby boomers, 13% are from Generation X, 6% are 70 and older, with the remaining 20% younger than 15.ⁱⁱ The largest of these population groups being the millennial's, it certainly makes sense to examine in some depth the traits that set them apart from previous generations. What are their preferences in regards to housing, employment, entertainment, leisure, and relationships? Are they really different from previous generations and to what degree?

Let us begin with some common traits attributed to millennials, also referred to occasionally in this paper as Generation Y. These are culled from the *US Chamber of Commerce Millennial Generation Research Review*ⁱⁱⁱ and are generalities of course, but do serve to describe that population at large.

From the report "Like every other generation, Millennials display generalized and unique traits. Economic, political, and social background influences the culture and creates a lasting impact. Changes cannot be fully understood for some time, usually around the time the unique characteristics of the next generation become recognized.... If each generation has a personality, you may say that the baby boomer is the idealist, shaped by Woodstock, JFK, RFK, and MLK. Generation X is the skeptical independent, shaped by latchkeys, Watergate, and the PC. Generation Y is the connected, diverse collaborator, shaped by 9/11, texting, and the recession. "

Consider, for a moment, that the millennial generation has, since birth, lived in a connected world. The vast stores of information available to them through the internet via their laptops and smartphones have shaped the way they perceive the world. They look at their own culture, not just through the lens of an American, but through the lens of a global citizen.

Good or bad, millennials are multi-taskers. To an extent, we all are, in the current age of technology, but there is some evidence to show that millennials brains are changing and adapting to better handle the barrage of information they face everyday.

My 16 year old son, for example, prefers to do homework with music playing, video streaming on his iPad, and texts popping up at regular intervals on his iPhone. He is an honor student by the way, and very well-adjusted socially. Other parents of kids his age report the same behavior in their teenagers as well.

Millennials profess to prefer urban-scale, walkable neighborhoods. They would prefer to have more transportation options than just cars, and place less value on home and car ownership. These proclivities are having a large impact on real estate markets, suburban tax bases, transit systems, and political preferences. Millennials are more likely to choose a career or job that fulfills them, then one that just pays well. One of my millennial interviewees, employed with a local non-profit, is willing to draw a smaller salary at a job that makes him feel like he is making a difference, and has passed up opportunities for advancement in the corporate world.

Millennials, like all generations before them, are staking their own territory and have a strong desire to shape their world into a better place. Armed with a global perspective, and the vast resources of the internet and technology, they are finding solutions to problems previous generations were helpless to solve, and they are being forced to react and respond to new, unique problems other generations never encountered.

It appears that there are some housing and transportation issues where millennials could drive substantial changes in direction and execution, but in general, what do their preferences tell us about how to attract and retain them in Fort Wayne?

Let's look quickly at the results from the interviews I conducted and recorded for my research on this topic. Here are some example questions and a few of their responses. Keep in mind my interviewees ranged in age from 16 to almost 80.

By way of background, one question reads, "Where are you from?" Answers included Fort Wayne, Chicago, and New York City. "How long have you lived in Fort Wayne?" Answers ranged from five years, to all of my life. "What frustrates you about Fort Wayne that would make you consider leaving?" Answers include "narrowness of vision, slow to adopt change, lack of risk-taking, and not particularly aspirational". "What is Fort Wayne missing?" was another question. People responded "retail, downtown retail, diversity, diversity in leadership, riverfront development, and dealing with race issues". Not one to dwell on the negative. I asked the question "what does Fort Wayne have going for it?'. I heard answers like "very welcoming community, groups of people innovating and trying to make Fort

Wayne great, people are beginning to accept new ideas, affordable, renewed investment in neighborhoods and downtown". I asked "is quality of life in Fort Wayne improving or declining?" The unanimous answer was that is "improving". Looking back at all of these responses, it became clear to me that our views of Fort Wayne's problems, and our optimism about it's future are strikingly similar, despite our differences in age and amount of years spent here in Fort Wayne. We generally agree on the problems or shortcomings, and we are generally optimistic about the direction we are heading into the future. We have momentum on our side. We are on our way to "getting our swagger back" as Quest member Mac Parker so intriguingly puts it.

Considering that we generally seem to agree on the problems, and that we are prepared to tackle the issue of talent attraction and retention in Fort Wayne, how do we define success? Typically success in the realm of city planning and citizen customer satisfaction is measured in dollars. How much investment can we attract to grow the tax base and thus be equipped to pay for growth of infrastructure, service, and amenity. Are there jobs available for all who seek them? Is there a range of housing options for our people to choose from? Does our transportation system provide for quick and efficient movement within, throughout, and across our metro?

These things are all obviously important, and we have, as a matter of policy and practice, focused on achieving this type of success with varying degrees of success.

I believe and contend that we are missing something in this city building experiment. That as we have strived for prosperity, freedom, and happiness – we

have succeeded in the former, while falling short in the latter. We are prosperous. We have achieved great wealth both privately and publicly, but are we happy and free?

The Psychology of Happiness

Let's shift gears for a moment and talk about happiness and well-being. I included one question in my interviews that related to happiness. It was, "name three things you need to be happy". The various answers are all children of these three things - love, health, and beauty.

Considering the great strides we have made in technology and in our standard of living in the last 70 years, we are not, unfortunately, any happier. As a matter of fact, our self-reported life-satisfaction has remained stagnant across that time period. One in ten Americans are taking antidepressants, and college students in 2007 were six to eight times more likely to be clinically depressed than in 1938.^{iv} We have achieved the great dream of being able to own a home in a shiny new neighborhood, with two-car garages on finely landscaped, neatly sub-divided parcels of association controlled property. We have dozens of restaurant and leisure opportunities available to us within a relatively short drive. Our roads, which speed us quickly from cul-de-sac to commercial center, are wide and free of obstruction. We can travel from the northernmost edge of the city limits to the southern in forty minutes and hardly notice downtown, thanks to our state highway system. This freedom of movement and great prosperity should certainly make us happier than when our

best option was to hop on the inter-urban rail to travel the same distance, yet it hasn't.

Why hasn't our surge in wealth and standard of living across the country resulted in a surge of happiness and well-being?

One explanation is our tendency to shift our expectations as we shift our economic outlook. As we make more money and achieve greater success, we are less satisfied with our current earnings and the lifestyles they afford, and we want just a little bit more. This is certainly true in my own life.

When I graduated from college for example, I was content to just secure a job that would pay the rent. As I observed my co-workers and others making a bit more than me - taking vacations, buying homes, and convertibles, I suddenly realized I would be much happier if I could afford those things as well. Welcome to the hedonic treadmill - the theory that states as a person makes more money, expectations and desires rise in tandem, which results in no permanent gain in happiness. This is not a new phenomenon - In 1621, Robert Burton declares "A true saying it is, desire hath no rest, it is infinite in itself, endless, and as one calls it, a perpetual rack, or horse-mill"^v (going round in circles).

Despite this tendency I've just described, we certainly do have the constitution and the ability to more reasonably manage our expectations and consequently, our happiness and well-being. We have the ability to be grateful for our accomplishments and good fortune and to be content in our circumstances.

Another explanation for our lack of rising joy, considering our rising standard of living, is that perhaps the things which we believe will make us happy simply do not. What if the neighborhoods we choose to live in, the types of development we encourage and incentivize, the lifestyles we have created for ourselves do not make us happy?

According to Charles Montgomery in the book *Happy City, Transforming Our Lives Through Urban Design* there is "an emerging consensus among psychologists and behavioral economists that as individuals, and as a species, humans just aren't that well equipped to make decisions that maximize our happiness. We make predictable mistakes when deciding where and how to live, and the architects, planners and builders who create the landscapes that help shape our decisions are prone to some of the very same mistakes..."

Allow me one example to help illustrate how this happens.

A Jewish story^{vi} tells about a little boy who said to his schoolmates: "My father is terrible. Last night he wanted to hit me four times." One of the boy's friends asked: "How did you know he wanted to hit you?" "Well," the boy answered, "if he didn't want to hit me, why did he?" In reality, the father probably did not **want** to hit his son. A series of previous events in the father's life or day - job frustration, marital woes, and his own abuse perhaps, are what led him to hit. Not the **desire** to hit him. Therefore, we shouldn't assume or believe that what we see around us in relation to how we build our cities is what we really want. It could be the result of many expedient, though not necessarily lofty or best practices and decisions. Does this

explain the predominance of bland, average architecture and landscape we have surrounded ourselves with? Would we not be happier and more fulfilled people if we were surrounded by beauty? Is this what we should aspire to?

In the end, I think Maslow got it right. Maslow's Hierarchy of Need describes our varied needs as humans.

These do not necessarily happen in order, but generally, our basic needs must be met in order to have the time and energy to devote to higher needs. We become happier the more we are able to experience self-actualization, thus self-actualization is important to define. Despite its name, self-actualization is really about how we interact with others. It is the development of ones full potential in a way that connects with the rest of the world. In social settings, self actualization translates to synergy, or people working together in harmony.^{vii} Our cities play a large role in to what degree we feel connected to others. It is not quite that simple however. Despite feeling the need to connect with other human beings, we also are hard-wired to need the option of privacy. We must balance our need for connectedness, with our need to retreat and to reflect. It is no coincidence that our brains release oxytocin, the pleasure hormone, when we help others and work together. Everyone benefits when everyone cooperates.

Yet, we are all governed to different degrees by self interest. From *Happy City*, "This ambiguity is written into the fabric of cities. The Greeks strove for individual achievement and protected their families in walled homes while championing the polis in the agora. Rome rose as its wealth was poured into the common good of

aqueducts and roads, and then declined as it was hoarded in private villas and palaces." What lessons can we learn from these examples and from the psychology of happiness, to apply to a more effective way of city building?

City Planning as Practice

As a practice, city planning emerged in response to industrialization, an increase in population, largely through immigration, and the growth of cities, or urbanization. The age of industry saw people moving from the countryside into factory towns to pursue the dreams made possible and promised by industrialization. This is referred to as the Second Migration, the First Migration being settlers migrating across North America.

During this industrial revolution, the Third Migration saw more and more people moving into large cities, which were becoming increasingly polluted and crowded. Garbage filled the rivers and the air was choked with smoke. Soot covered everything. The inaugural test of self-regulation by industry failed miserably. The quality of life in cities grew poorer even as industry workers achieved a measure of success.

Tenements were quickly built to house the population influx. They were built with little foresight or planning, and they were dangerous. It became evident that city leaders were failing their citizens.

Two primary planning movements were born in response to this civic void - the Garden Cities movement in Europe and the City Beautiful movement in the United States. The movements were similar and generally concurrent, but there were differences.

The garden city movement was a method of urban planning proposed and championed by Ebenezer Howard in the United Kingdom. He put forth the idea that cities should be intentionally planned as self-contained communities surrounded by Greenbelts. These planned communities should contain proportionate areas of residences, industry and agriculture.

Howard's Garden Cities promised everything – the beauty of nature, social opportunity, fields and parks of easy access, low rents, high wages, pure air and water, no slums, no smoke, freedom, and cooperation! My goodness it sounds idyllic. Like many designers, Howard held an exceptionally high opinion of himself and it would seem, believed he had discovered the way to utopia.

But what becomes of the smoke and the factories? As you can see in the diagram in your handout (hold up), the factories have been re-located to the edge of the city. The civic services located at the center of the circle, surrounded by a vast central park - next a ring of homes and gardens, then a grand avenue with schools and even more parkland. A necklace of factories circles the city, followed by farms, agriculture, and a railroad loop at the outermost edge. Six radial boulevards provided access to and from the city center.

The troubling component of the Garden City plan is the area surrounding the city. The asylums for the blind and the deaf, the feeble-minded children's cottage homes, the farm for epileptics, convalescent homes, all located outside of the city. It appears that if you were sick or old, you would be banished to the country and separated from the general population.

Similar, in fact, to our tendency in the near past and even today, to locate long term care facilities and senior housing at the periphery of cities, rather than where they would have better access to services that would allow them to remain self-sufficient. That is the problem with utopias – there is no such thing.

Meanwhile, across the pond in the United States, the City Beautiful movement gathered steam.

The turn-of-the-century City Beautiful movement influenced the design, planning, and management of American cities from New York to San Francisco. Its effects are still felt today. Wide, tree-lined boulevards and monumental but low-lying buildings — libraries and museums, town halls and train stations — were designed to break up the familiar American gridiron of clogged streets and uncontrolled growth.

It was a movement brought forth by the elite, but its founders saw it as an exercise in participatory politics aimed at changing the way citizens thought about their cities. City beautiful depended on public participation - from voter approved bond issues to citizen advocacy on behalf of beautification.

Charles Mumford Robison, a journalist and writer, wrote the first guide to city planning in 1901. It was haughtily titled *The Improvement of Towns and Cities or Practical Basis of Civic Aesthetics*. This text was important, in that it set up the city planner as a professional responsible for the public good. Robison uses examples of old and new cities across the world to describe physical characteristics and how they influence livability and beauty. He goes on to advocate numerous strategies for planning livable cities.

My favorite quote from the book being, "There is no panacea for the ugliness, dreariness, or monotony of towns and cities: there is no one road to victory. There must be parallel conquests by highway and by footpath, by field and wood, by hill and dale. There is work enough for all and a place for each. The specialist, seeing much in little, does not see far. In zeal for pavements one forgets the trees; in zeal for parks the thoroughfare is forgotten..."^{viii} This reminds us that the task of designing and planning cities is best shared across disciplines as it's complexity fails to unravel at the feet of only the planner, the architect, the landscape architect, or the elected.

I would be remiss, as a landscape architect, if I did not mention the work of a couple of landscape architects who had a major impact in the City Beautiful Movement and in the design of cities across the country. First there was Andrew Jackson Downing, the true father of landscape architecture, and a man after my own heart. He was a designer, a horticulturist, writer, and like many architects who dabble in landscape architecture, he was a landscape architect who dabbled in architecture. He was a prominent advocate of the gothic revival style in the United States and designed many homes. He has been credited with popularizing the front porch, and I thank him often as I enjoy a cigar in the evening on my own front porch. This is not why I bring up Mr. Downing. Well before the City Beautiful movement in the U.S., Andrew understood the importance of nature in the city. He predicted, and began to write about the importance of public parks as early as 1844. It was he, who convinced the State of New York to appoint the Central Park Commission to organize a design competition for the design of Central Park.

He also convinced his partner in practice Calbert Vaux, and a young, green, landscape architect named Frederick Law Olmsted to enter the competition. Of course they won. The **idea** behind Central Park spread across the country. In 1912, Fort Wayne's leaders had the good sense and foresight to hire landscape architect and planner George Kessler to develop a city master plan, which would establish our wonderful park and boulevard system, only partially realized, yet still enjoyed by all of us today.

As the profession and practice of city planning grew it began to lose sight of these noble goals. Planning theories were developed in response to economic realities, as adjustments to successes and failures, and through scholarly research. The resulting theories and riffs on theories all fell generally beneath the umbrella of rational planning theory. Rational planning theory emphasized the improvement of the built environment according to set of spatial factors recognized to be important. Rational planning gave way in the fifties and sixties to synoptic planning which evolved into a series of planning movements including the mixed scanning model, transitive planning, incrementalism, bargaining model, communicative approach, et cetera and so on. Pretty dry stuff, right? What happened to all the talk of beauty and social justice, of artistry and the common good? The design of our cities, I am reluctant, yet compelled to report, has been taken over by accountants, real estate speculators, and engineers.

In this great mid west city of Fort Wayne - how did these forces of planning, circumstance, and will combine to make her what she is today? Considering what we have just learned about the birth of the planning movement in response to the

dirty, industrial city, it has become apparent that the rules and methods established at that time, in those conditions, may not be the rules and methods most appropriate for today's city.

There are two flawed design ideologies which explain how we've jumped the rails. The first ideology is the belief that the strict segregation of uses is the only way to plan a healthy city. This separation of uses by means of strict, legally enforced zoning laws has resulted in anything but an organically developed city, driven by the will of it's people. I am not referring to the thoughtful regulation governing the placement of factories and heavy industry, which is necessary of course for our health and safety – but the misguided notion that commercial, office, and retail development must be separated from residential development. This practice forces us into our cars every time we need a gallon of milk, a book of stamps, or an expertly prepared meal from our favorite restaurant.

The second flawed design ideology is the "need for speed". This is the idea that our freedom directly corresponds to our velocity. We have operated from a belief that it was our greatest priority to quickly move people, but only in cars, out of the urban city, through the urban city, and into the urban city with little to no concern for those who could not, or choose not to drive. What then, of our freedom to move slowly? This is not our right in today's city, by design.

This ideology has driven, and continues to drive our transportation policy.

These policies, along with the financial incentives and massive public investment associated with them, have painted us into a corner. More accurately I suppose, they have driven us further and further apart. Our city is dispersed. We have fled from

our city center to escape a danger, once present, which is longer there. This was called the "fourth migration" and it continues today.

New Paradigms in City Design

I will not deceive myself into believing that we can change this paradigm overnight. It is also true that the practice of city planning is beginning to see and understand that we must find more people-focused ways of designing cities.

One such new paradigm is called Smart Growth. Time constraints prevent me from fully explaining what I have learned about the types of neighborhoods we would most like to live in, but I can tell you that our neighborhoods today in Fort Wayne are incomplete. I believe we **do** want walkable, mixed-use neighborhoods where we have the freedom to choose to walk to a neighborhood café or to the grocery for ingredients for our dinner that evening. I also believe that the one thing that could jumpstart Fort Wayne's renaissance is a progressive transit policy and infrastructure. More and wider roads are not the answer. We can look at every mid-size and major city and see empirically that this strategy only results in more cars on the road and longer commute times. We have the benefit of hindsight in this matter. Let's not make the same mistakes.

Smart Growth begins to modify and replace existing zoning codes and ordinances to allow for, and encourage the type of redevelopment and development that people really want. Specific strategies include:

Allowing or requiring mixed-use development in neighborhoods.

Benefits include livelier urban spaces with public gathering places and a variety of shops, restaurants, and entertainment; complete neighborhoods where residents

can live, work, and play; diversity of housing for people of all incomes and at all stages of life; more vibrant commercial areas that provide retail and services for patrons; and more compact development that helps preserve open space in outlying areas by reducing the need and demand for low-density, sprawling development. When developed near transit stops and near, or within existing urban and suburban neighborhoods, these types of developments can be especially successful.

Another strategy is to:

Modernize street standards to slow down traffic and accommodate multiple modes of travel.

Benefits include, improved safety for drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists; more walking and biking with attendant health benefits; value added to abutting properties and surrounding neighborhoods; a more attractive city or town with more economic vitality and resiliency; a more flexible, adaptive network to help avoid congestion; and allowing people to drive less with no reduction in mobility.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency published the *Essential Smart Growth Fixes for Urban and Suburban Zoning Codes*^{ix} in 2009. The strategies I just mentioned, along with many others, are outlined in this document. There is no lack of scholarship in this area, nor is lack of consensus in its general benefit, there is only lack of awareness and desire.

While Smart Growth is a step in the right direction, it has the potential to be nearly as unwieldy and slow to adapt as our current planning paradigm. We should consider a more nimble, fast-reacting component as part of our strategy. You see, it's taken almost one hundred years to see the effect our planning policy has had on

our cities. We have allowed no freedom to experiment. I propose we embrace the strategy of tactical urbanism and develop other similar tools that allow us to "try before buying". The *Tactical Urbanism Guidebook*^x was created by the Street Plans Collaborative, an urban design and planning advocacy firm. The guidebook describes ways in which people can affect change at a neighborhood scale. It allows for experimentation. Wonder how a protected bike lane would be received and utilized along Anthony Boulevard? Rather than pay millions of dollars to impose a permanent solution, why not set up temporary pavement markings and barriers and see how it goes? Identify weaknesses in the design and quickly make changes, adapting to how people are actually using the space. This can be applied to reducing travel lanes for improved safety, or removing traffic entirely to create vibrant public spaces. If they are embraced and are functional, outstanding, make them permanent. If not, pack it up and go try something different.

Regardless of which new paradigms we embrace, we must progress. The Fifth Migration is underway. Across the globe, and coming soon to Fort Wayne, we are moving back into our city centers. How do we best plan for this influx, while improving, or retro-fitting our suburbs to be more people friendly? This is our challenge moving forward from today.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I fear I may have painted a dire picture of the state of our cities. The state of our city. I do not shrink from that, but I do offer an optimistic thought on our future. We speak of momentum today in Fort Wayne. How do we attract young people? Our young people are simply asking for the things we have all forgotten we

wanted – beauty, community, connection, and civic pride. They are expressing a desire for cities with infrastructure that is sustainable and fosters human connection. They feel the same loss of human connection that we all feel. It is time to expect more from our cities, from our leaders, and from ourselves. Let us take on the task of creating a noble city with joy and optimism, utilizing these new ways of designing cities, while supporting fully those things which we know to be good about Fort Wayne. Our parks, our people, our spirit, and our innovation are what make Fort Wayne exceptional. In twenty years, I hope to have the privilege of delivering another Quest paper; a paper where I can look back on that twenty years, evaluating once again our efforts, and can report with confidence that we do indeed live in a noble city.

ⁱ Bacon, Edmund N. "The City As An Act of Will." *Design of Cities*. New York, NY: Penguin, 1976. 13. Print.

ⁱⁱ "American FactFinder - Community Facts." *American FactFinder - Community Facts*. N.p., 2010. Web. 2 Jan. 2016.

ⁱⁱⁱ "The Millennial Generation Research Review." *U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation*. N.p., 14 Nov. 2012. Web. 10 Oct. 2015.

^{iv} Montgomery, Charles. "The Mayor of Happy." *Happy City: Transforming Our Lives through Urban Design*. N.p.: n.p., n.d. 11. Print.

^v Burton, Robert, and Holbrook Jackson. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. New York: New York Review of, 2001. Print.

^{vi} Etheredge, Lloyd S. "What Do We Really Want?" *PsycCRITIQUES* 30.4 (1985): n. pag. Web. 12 Oct. 2015.

^{vii} "Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs: What Motivates Behavior?" *About.com Health*. N.p., n.d. Web. 3 Nov. 2015.

^{viii} Robinson, Charles Mulford. *Improvement of Towns and Cities*. S.l.: Nabu, 2010. Print.

^{ix} Nelson, Kevin. *Essential Smart Growth Fixes for Urban and Suburban Zoning Codes*. Washington, D.C.: United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2009. Print.

^x Lydon, Mike, Anthony Garcia, and Andres Duany. *Tactical Urbanism: Short-term Action for Long-term Change*. N.p.: n.p., n.d. Print.

Bibliography

1. "American FactFinder - Community Facts." *American FactFinder - Community Facts*. N.p., 2010. Web. 2 Jan. 2016.
2. Bacon, Edmund N. *Design of Cities*. New York, NY: Penguin, 1976. 13. Print.
3. Burton, Robert, and Holbrook Jackson. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. New York: New York Review of, 2001. Print.
4. Etheredge, Lloyd S. "What Do We Really Want?" *PsycCRITIQUES* 30.4 (1985): n. pag. Web. 12 Oct. 2015.
5. Lydon, Mike, Anthony Garcia, and Andres Duany. *Tactical Urbanism: Short-term Action for Long-term Change*. N.p.: n.p., n.d. Print.
6. "Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs: What Motivates Behavior?" *About.com Health*. N.p., n.d. Web. 3 Nov. 2015.
7. Montgomery, Charles. *Happy City: Transforming Our Lives through Urban Design*. N.p.: n.p., n.d. 11. Print.
8. Nelson, Kevin. *Essential Smart Growth Fixes for Urban and Suburban Zoning Codes*. Washington, D.C.: United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2009. Print.

-
9. Robinson, Charles Mulford. *Improvement of Towns and Cities*. S.l.: Nabu, 2010. Print.
 10. "Census Flows Mapper - Geography - US Census Bureau." *Census Flows Mapper - Geography - US Census Bureau*. N.p., n.d. Web. 5 Feb. 2016.
 11. "Why Smarter Land Use Can Help Cities Attract and Retain Young Adults." *Why Smarter Land Use Can Help Cities Attract and Retain Young Adults*. N.p., n.d. Web. 22 Jan. 2016.
 12. "Are the "urban Millennials" a Real Thing?" *StatChat*. N.p., n.d. Web. 7 Sept. 2015.
 13. Lachman, Leanne, and Deborah Brett. "Gen Y and Housing." *Urban Land Institute* (n.d.): n. pag. 2015. Web. 5 Sept. 2015.
 14. Cortwright, Joe, and .. *The Young and Restless and the Nation's Cities*(n.d.): n. pag. Web. 14 Aug. 2015.